



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

mation. The note to 4. 1427 concerning the names of the Hesperides is in point. One tradition, we are vaguely told, includes Hestia among them. Now the only authority for Hestia as one of the Hesperides is the text of Apollodori Bibliotheca, II 114 (Wagner), where *Ἑσπερία* stands by emendation in recent editions. The names of the Hesperides are perhaps not of vital importance, yet one who seeks would surely find something of value to say about them. One observation is certainly a mistake: 3. 276 is called an imitation of Anacreon 3. 27; that is, "Anacreon" is quoted from an edition that does not discern between Anacreon and the Anacreontea. On other than literary grounds the genuineness of this poem (Bergk 31), can be disputed. I once entered in my Apollonius this quotation from one of Miss Harrison's popular essays, which is, to be sure, nothing more than the light of common day but suffices as a side-light for our passage: "Eros is a stranger to black-figured art; in red-figured vases he is a slender youth; only in the Alexandrian and Roman periods a baby boy". In connection with Eros one is reminded of Helbig's *Untersuchungen über die Campanische Wandmalerei*, a book whose importance for the higher interpretation of Apollonius has not suffered by the passage of forty years. Finally, the note to 4. 478 which concerns a special form of the saliva charm should be corrected by a reference to Aeschylus frag. 354; cf. Rohde's *Psyche* I. 326, where there is an elaborate discussion of *μασχαλισμός*.

In conclusion let me say that this review is written in full consciousness of the special difficulties that beset an editor of Apollonius, and in the belief that cooperation on the part of all who concern themselves with the *Argonautica* is most desirable. Perhaps one should be content if the editor has in this case accomplished what he proposed to himself, to occupy the field and to bring together the most accessible material. Nevertheless one may well regret that when so sumptuous a volume was planned, a more exacting standard was not set.

EDWARD FITCH.

HAMILTON COLLEGE.

---

La Vie de Saint Remi, Poème du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle, Par Richier, Publié pour la première fois d'après deux manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Royale de Bruxelles, par W. N. BOLDERSTON. London: Henry Frowde, 1912. Pp. 356. 8vo.

In 877-8 that famous ecclesiastical ruffian, Hincmar, wrote a political pamphlet under the guise of a biography of St. Remi, his predecessor in the diocese of Reims. To enhance his own

arrogant claims to hierarchic primacy, he exploited the reputation of the saint by inventing or borrowing the most puerile stories in regard to his miraculous powers, generally used to punish violators of church property, and by forging a will attributing to St. Remi the widest sphere of influence. This *Vita S. Remigii* was one of the most popular of medieval hagiographies, to judge from the number of times it appears in its entirety in collections of saints' lives, and in extracts in collections of exempla. It is not surprising to find that it was translated into French, twice in the thirteenth century, once in verse, and once in prose. It is the former version that Mr. Bolderston has edited or rather printed in this volume.

For Mr. Bolderston does not seem to have one of the requirements necessary to an editor of an Old-French text. First of all he knows nothing about the subject of the work he attempts to edit. The *Vita of Hincmar*, its principal source, is only known to him in the edition of the *Acta Sanctorum*, reprinted in Migne's *Patrologia*. It is unfortunate he was not acquainted with Krusch's studies on, and edition (*M. G. H. Script. Rer. Merov. III*), which could have been used to such advantage in both the study of the sources, and in the construction of the text. He would have been led to the conclusion that the whole of the French work had a single source in an interpolated manuscript of the *Vita*, similar to three manuscripts noted by Krusch (*Op. cit.* 245-6), representing a compilation of some scribe, interested in the pretensions of Reims. Thus the stories of St. Peter and St. Paul assisting St. Remi in saying mass (5753-5912), and of Moderan of Rennes (7175-7360) did not have their source in the version of Flodoard (I 17 and 20), but in that found in the interpolated *Vita* (*Op. cit.*, 245, 257; *Neues Archiv*, XVIII, 566-8; cf. 568, n. 4 with vv. 7297-7300). But Flodoard was cited in this compilation as the authority for the will of the saint (5979-5993), because a later forgery, interpolated into this work (I, 18), supported the extravagant claims of Reims even more strongly than the forgery of Hincmar of which one finds an abstract in a later chapter of the genuine work (I, 23; cf. *Op. cit.*, 243). The same compilation also owed to Flodoard (II 19) the account of the vision of Raduin in regard to Ebbo (7361-7498), whose name, in its French form 'Jebès', disconcerted Mr. Bolderston in his search for the source of the story. It is one of the three visions that Richier found in, and translated from, his original, which owed their existence to the political scheming which had its centre at Reims. The first of these, the vision of Eucherius in regard to Charles Martel, and the influence it had on Pepin (365-380), was a cock and bull story devised by Hincmar for the benefit of the victorious Louis II (*M. G. Capitularia*, II, 432); that of Raduin was written as an attack on the immediate predecessor of Hincmar, who, no doubt could have named its author, and the Vision of Charles III

was inspired by the successor of Hincmar in the diocese of Reims (W. Levison, *Neues Archiv*, XXVII, 399 ff.; 493 ff.). According to our editor the last of these "n'a jamais été publié dans l'original" (14), and so he presents the learned world with an edition based on the two manuscripts known to him (34-38). Some twenty manuscripts, however, have been noted by others, and it has been published no less than fifteen times (Levison, *op. cit.* 401, 493, n., 501-2; cf. A. J. P. XXXII, 217).

If it is evident that the author of this compilation, the original of the French work of Richier, was an ecclesiastic, connected with the diocese of Reims, there can be no doubt but that the translator worked for the greater glory of the same cause, and for the same reason, even if superiors commissioned him to do his work (vv. 20-27). He clearly wrote in an eastern French dialect, probably that of Champagne, but neither Mr. Bolderston's text, nor the material he brings together in his treatment of the dialect in his introduction, justifies him in stating that the author and the scribes of the two manuscripts, containing the poem, wrote in the dialect peculiar to the city of Reims. Much water has flowed under the bridges since 1884, the date of Foerster's first edition of the *Cligès*, the most recent book on eastern French dialects used by Mr. Bolderston. The text as printed can only be understood by a more continual reference to the Latin original than the editor ever made, and some of the passages must have remained as inexplicable to him as to the reader, to judge from the meagre knowledge of Old-French he displays in the glossary. Thus he adopts the inferior reading, or copies wrongly, in the passage:

Sire, uns arsons, . . .  
Dont je trai *beusons* et piles (1367, 1369),

and gives a curious etymological translation; "*Beusons*, pièce de bois (terme de chasse)". The reading "*bouions*" of MS. B gives the correct form of the very common Old-French word; Flèche ferrée d'une tête plate ou à quatre pointes obtuses et émoussées (Gay). The saint prayed over an empty tun of wine; as a result;

li vins sorst si largement  
De la tonne par s' oroison  
Qu'il s'espendi a teil foison  
Par le bondon eu pavement (1578-1581).

Our editor defines: "*Bondon*, *ventre*". But "*bondon*" is a good French word to-day, meaning nothing but the bung-hole of a tun or cask. In one place the help of the saint was badly needed on account of rats who could not be caught:

Par rois ne par trebuches tendre (5390),

i. e. by laying snares or setting traps. The editor makes difficulties for himself by rendering "*rois*" by *petit faisceau*, and

“trebuche” by *lutte, machine de guerre*. But the most unfortunate and amusing interpretation is made on a passage in regard to a layman who became archbishop of Reims, who

comme clers iert rooingniés (311).

What horrible fate befel this unfortunate if we believe with Mr. Bolderston that “rooingnier” means *trancher*? Was he sliced up properly, or as an ecclesiastic did he conform literally to a well known passage of St. Paul? Our fears are allayed when we know that this very common word should have been glossed by *couper, tondre, tonsurer*. It looks very much as if Mr. Bolderston were as ignorant of modern as he is of medieval French.

GEORGE L. HAMILTON.